



**Land Use and Long
Range Planning**

5800 Shier Rings Road
Dublin, Ohio 43016-1236

phone 614.410.4600
fax 614.410.4747

www.dublinohiousa.gov

ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW TEAM

MEETING MINUTES

MAY 1, 2014

ART Members and Designees: Steve Langworthy, Director of Planning; Gary Gunderman, Planning Manager; Alan Perkins, Fire Marshal; Fred Hahn, Director of Parks and Open Space; Dave Marshall, Review Services Analyst; Ray Harpham, Commercial Plans Examiner; Barb Cox, Engineering Manager; Jeff Tyler, Building Standards Director; Lieutenant Steve Farmer, Police; and Colleen Gilger, Economic Development Director.

Other Staff: Rachel Ray, Planner II; Claudia Husak, Planner II; Katie Ashbaugh, Planning Assistant; and Laurie Wright, Staff Assistant.

Applicants: Daniel Pardi, pH7 Architects (Case 1); Jon Andrews, Sign-A-Rama Powell; Christine Pope and Dr. John Sotos, River's Edge Pediatrics, Inc.; Vance Thornton, Advance Construction, Inc. (Case 2); John Gavin, Custom Sign Center (Case 4); Nelson Yoder and Matt Starr, Crawford Hoying Development Partners (Cases 5 and 6).

Steve Langworthy called the meeting to order. He asked if there were any amendments to the April 24, 2014, meeting minutes. [There were none.] The minutes were accepted into the record as presented.

DETERMINATIONS

- 1. BSC Indian Run Neighborhood District – Medical Office Building**
Architectural Modifications
250 West Bridge Street
Minor Project Review
- 14-034MPR**

Rachel Ray said this is a request to add a 288-square-foot, two-story building addition for an elevator shaft on the north side of an existing medical office building at the northwest corner of the intersection of Bridge Street and Shawan Falls Drive in the BSC Indian Run Neighborhood District. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said this application was introduced last week and after review, it is proposed that the ART recommend approval of this application with one condition:

- 1) That the change in impervious to pervious surface is noted on the building permit plans.

Steve Langworthy recalled that obtaining matching brick was a concern last week and asked the applicant if he was successful finding the matching brick color.

Dan Pardi said they were still looking but will submit a sample with the building permit.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any questions or comments. [There were none.] He said he hoped the applicant could find the right brick and asked him if he understood and agreed with the condition.

Mr. Pardi said he agreed to the condition.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed the ART's approval of this request for Minor Project Review with one condition.

**2. BSC Commercial District – Shoppes at River Ridge – River's Edge Pediatrics – Sign
14-035MPR 4335 West Dublin-Granville Road
Minor Project Review**

Rachel Ray said this is a request to install an approximately 18-square-foot wall sign for a new medical office tenant in the Shoppes at River Ridge shopping center at the southeast corner of the intersection of West Dublin-Granville Road and Dale Drive. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said after reviewing the case and the recommendations from the City's graphic design consultant, Studio Graphique, Planning recommends the following:

1. The proposed sign meets the Zoning Code requirements for height, size, color, and number but because there is no real good location for the sign due to the architecture, to move it off to the side so it could be centered in one of the sections/frames in front of the doors;
2. To square off the sign corners; and
3. Replace the proposed gooseneck light features with canned recessed lighting.

Ms. Ray explained that the above comments were discussed with the applicant and they prefer to keep the sign in its original proposed location but agreed to identify a canned recessed light fixture.

Ms. Ray recommended ART's approval of this application with three conditions:

- 1) That the applicant submit a floor plan confirming the dimensions of the leased tenant space as part of the sign permit;
- 2) That the sign be relocated and slightly reconfigured to fit within the frame opening over the primary business entrance, subject to Planning approval; and
- 3) That the applicant provide the sign lighting details as part of the sign permit application, subject to Planning approval.

Ms. Ray recommended ART's approval of an Administrative Departure for the requirement of a wall sign as this sign is not being placed directly on the wall associated with the tenant space.

Ms. Ray asked the applicants if they would like to comment.

Dr. John Sotos, River's Edge Pediatrics, Inc. said there are two doors on the front of their tenant space, and to ensure proper flow of their offices, the door on the right (south door) will be used as the entrance and the door on the left (north door) will be an exit only. He said they preferred the sign be centered over the space rather than off to the side but would not oppose the design change of squaring off the corners. He reiterated that ingress/egress of the space is an issue. He added that they may add bench seating in the future to take advantage of the covered porch.

Christine Pope, River's Edge Pediatrics, Inc., said that when their patients drive into the parking lot they want to best identify their entire tenant space, and the location centered on the covered porch will ensure that the sign is visible from patients driving into the center.

Jon Andrews, Sign-A-Rama Powell, said it only makes sense to center it over the whole space and the doors will be identified as being either "Entrance" or "Exit."

Vance Thornton, Advance Construction, Inc. said he disagrees with the recommendation of covering one full panel with the sign. He said by shifting the sign four feet, it would look better from the parking lot.

Dr. Sotos said he did not even want that and noted other spaces that have the signs centered over their tenant spaces.

Steve Langworthy said most of the signs are centered but they have one door that is also centered that serves as their primary entrance. He noted that in this case, there is no distinction between the two doors that would identify one as the primary entrance.

Ms. Pope said they will have vinyl signs on the window next to the door for distinction between which doors are intended to be used for entering and exiting.

Dr. Sotos said the address numerals will be moved.

Ms. Pope said patients will park at the right side of the parking lot, immediately to the south of the building and would pass the entry door first.

Fred Hahn confirmed that the back side of the sign would be painted white.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Mr. Hahn said that if covering a panel in the frame is preferred, he suggested the right panel over the entrance.

Dave Marshall said he likes it centered within the overall elevation and agrees with the applicant's original proposal. He said the view of the space, when stepping back, would look off balance if the sign were shifted in either direction to fill up a panel.

Alan Perkins was not concerned from an emergency response standpoint if the sign were centered. He said he was concerned with the mechanics of the sign and how it would be illuminated.

Mr. Thornton said he was the contractor hired for the interior construction work and said that recessed canned lighting can be installed anywhere along the soffit.

Mr. Langworthy stated that his view was based on the Code requirement that the storefront entrances be clearly identified.

Barb Cox said an address is needed and should be clearly marked at the entrance.

Ray Harpham suggested centering the sign over the third post on the right.

Colleen Gilger said she preferred the sign located in the center of the tenant space. She stated that the designs of these tenant spaces make it appear as though each building segment is its own little "house" or building, so the center is better for this tenant space, especially since both doors and the porch are all part of the space.

Lieutenant Farmer agreed with Ms. Gilger that the sign should be placed in the center of the building as it appears to be designed as a stand-alone building.

Mr. Langworthy confirmed that there was general consensus among the ART members that the sign remain in the proposed location at the center of the tenant space. He said a revised condition would be necessary.

Ms. Ray read the modified second condition:

That the sign be centered on the tenant space but reconfigured to square off the corners, consistent with the consultant's recommendations, subject to Planning approval.

Barb Cox asked if they would be open during any evening hours and the response was no.

Mr. Langworthy noted the recommendation of approval for the Administrative Departure for the wall sign placement as mentioned earlier and asked if there were any questions or comments. [There were none.] He confirmed that the Administrative Departure was approved.

Mr. Langworthy asked the applicant if the modified condition as read back by Ms. Ray was acceptable. The applicant said he agreed to the conditions.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments with respect to this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this request for Minor Project Review with three conditions.

3. BSC Indian Run Neighborhood District – OCLC

**Kilgour Building Entrance Improvements
6565 Kilgour Place
Minor Project Review**

14-036MPR

Rachel Ray said this is a request to refurbish the visitor and employee entrances on the north and northeast sides of the existing office building north of Post Road in the BSC Indian Run Neighborhood District. She said the proposal includes a request to replace the walkways and entrance ramps, install new light fixtures, seating areas, new planters, and landscaping. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray said the applicant was not present. She said the only update from last week was that the applicant has yet to choose specific site furnishings (seating and planters) and locations so a condition related to that is recommended.

Ms. Ray recommended ART's approval of this application with two conditions:

- 1) That the change in impervious to pervious surface is noted on the site permit plans; and
- 2) That the applicant submit the proposed site furnishing specifications and locations prior to installation, subject to Planning approval.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further comments with respect to this case. [There were none.] He confirmed the ART's approval of this request for Minor Project Review with two conditions.

INTRODUCTIONS

4. BSC-C – Red Roof Inn – Entry Modification 14-037MPR

5125 Post Road Minor Project Review

Rachel Ray said this is a request to add a canopy near the front entrance to an existing hotel building on the south side of Post Road, approximately 1,100 feet west of the intersection with Bridge Street. She said this is a request for review and approval of a Minor Project Review under the provisions of Zoning Code Section 153.066(G).

Ms. Ray presented the rendering that showed the existing wall sign with the proposed freestanding canopy constructed of an aluminum roof and side panel attached to metal posts. She said this is to be illuminated in red with both up and down lighting. She noted that after initial review, Planning recommended the following to better integrate the canopy with the surroundings:

- o Use a color that is more consistent with the Red Roof Inn's roof color that is more subdued shade of burgundy
- o Use the same siding as the balconies to better coordinate
- o Match the canopy pitch with the roof pitch as used in the Red Roof sign/logo
- o Use more substantial or natural poles to support the canopy
- o Use one direction on lighting, not both up and down lighting, and eliminate the proposed red lighting

John Gavin, Custom Sign Center, said his customer is making these changes and improvements to Red Roof Inn hotels nationwide. He said they desire a more welcoming approach and that is why the canopy is proposed. He said his client is emphasizing their improvements to announce their remodeling efforts. He thought the slope of the canopy could be closer to the slope of the hotel roof and the structure had to be substantial. He said the materials had to be a little different for the color of durable aluminum. He explained that the canopy has a great fire rating, is self-extinguishing, with a frame and a wall that make up the unit. He presented a sample board showing a better representation of the proposed colors. He explained that the customer believes that the stone wall adjacent to the canopy is not inviting and instead they are trying to get away from that older style. He offered to find another color if that was a problem but reiterated that the customer wants the up/down lighting and their need for lighting was based on safety.

Ms. Ray asked if the roof of the canopy is clear. Mr. Gavin replied that it was, but it was more translucent than clear.

Jeff Tyler asked if this canopy was being installed at any of the other local Red Roof Inn locations. Mr. Gavin said one is going in on the Ackerman Road site in a week. He said in a few weeks, at least a dozen will be installed nationwide.

Mr. Gavin provided additional pictures to show the entrance with the canopy in the daylight and at night. He said they are not removing the stone wall but will make it more inviting with landscaping.

Steve Langworthy said stone is a large part of Dublin's character, and in his view, the canopy design looks tacky and unappealing.

Ray Harpham said the rendering shows a bright red.

Mr. Langworthy noted that Planning would like different supports, materials, pitch, and lighting.

Ms. Ray said this application could be approved if it was better incorporated into the architecture of the building. She gave the applicant the option to modify the design, present an alternative, or that it could be sent for review and determination by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Mr. Langworthy asked the group for additional feedback.

Fred Hahn said it looks out of place for Dublin.

Colleen Gilger said she could be flexible on color but only if it was the same as the sign color due to a desire to maintain consistent branding. She said the pitch and wall is wrong but understands it is the brand color.

Mr. Gavin asked what the ART would suggest for an alternative frame material.

Ms. Ray suggested a natural material of some sort with a different color.

Mr. Gavin asked if that would be wood or a covering, as he is concerned about snow loads.

Mr. Hahn asked if they could replace the metal color with an anodized aluminum that matches one of the darker brown colors. Mr. Gavin asked if we were suggesting the frame be painted. Mr. Harpham suggested that it could be anodized. Mr. Gavin said anodizing and welding do not mix.

Mr. Tyler said this proposal is very short on design; it looked very "engineered" and needs to have a more custom design. He said it appears too spindly and needs to be more substantial and integrate better, as the mass does not appear to work.

Mr. Harpham said he was concerned with the lighting aspect and discouraged that many lights, especially in red.

Mr. Gavin reiterated that the customer wanted to make a marketing difference and this will actually be considered a Red Roof Plus.

Mr. Tyler said the changes need to fit better within the Dublin character.

Ms. Gilger stated she knows the brand is red, but red lighting can be associated with an "emergency" entrance or other connotations. She said Red Roof started here.

Mr. Harpham emphasized not using red lights.

Dave Marshall said the way the roof is framed, structurally it may be sound, but it looks flimsy. Mr. Gavin said it was comprised of 4 x 4 aluminum tubes.

Mr. Marshall said he sees the bold solid line in the Red Roof logo but the canopy pitch is not the same degree of bold, structural integrity. He said he was more inclined to approve the application if the canopy matched the logo using an identical red. He asked if the color could be changed to match the trim on the building. He said he is not surprised by the ART's reaction to this proposal as he has many concerns and is not comfortable approving.

Lieutenant Farmer said he agreed with the ART's comments.

Ms. Ray restated the options for next steps. Mr. Gavin said he would speak with the customer and confirm how they would like to proceed by Monday.

**5. Zoning Code Amendment – Bridge Street District – Riverside Neighborhood District
14-039ADMC Zoning Code Amendment**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for an amendment to the Zoning Code to establish a new Bridge Street District zoning district and related Code amendments for the Riverside Neighborhood District. She said this is a request for review and recommendation regarding proposed Zoning Code amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Ms. Ray said this application is a result of a development proposal submitted by Crawford Hoying for the mixed-use development project proposed along Riverside Drive. She presented the area this covers, which is for the land on the east side of the river only, and includes the driving range site.

Ms. Ray said the proposed new zoning district is a “neighborhood district,” which is a special zoning district for the major parts of the Bridge Street District with consolidated land ownership and the opportunity to establish a major critical mass of mixed use activity. She said the proposed zoning district regulations have been drafted to be very similar to the other neighborhood districts that were created for the Indian Run Neighborhood, Sawmill Center Neighborhood, and Historic Transition Neighborhood.

Steve Langworthy pointed out that if the City would have had property owners with an interest in this type of development back when the Code was originally written and the land was zoned, we may have proceeded differently and created a special neighborhood district for this area originally.

Ms. Ray said this land will develop in phases, but the neighborhood districts were set up to address the need to review larger developments to ensure that each phase would achieve the overall goal for the district. She agreed that when this area was originally zoned into the Bridge Street District zoning district, the previous land owners had wanted to retain their existing zoning as much as possible, and were not interested in this type of zoning district. She said that the zoning district must be changed to accommodate the type of mixed use development envisioned for this part of the Bridge Street District.

Ms. Ray said after a conference call with the City’s Law Director this afternoon, they determined that the City should be the sole applicant on both the Zoning Code amendment and the Zoning Map Amendment, consistent with the process originally initiated for the Bridge Street District. She said next Thursday the ART can recommend these cases to go forward to the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Ray said the Zoning Code amendments have to happen before the area rezoning. She suggested that the text changes be viewed in the report that will show the “Track Changes” which will be placed in the Drop Box.

Mr. Langworthy asked Nelson Yoder, Crawford Hoying Development Partners, if he had anything else to add.

Mr. Yoder said he is comfortable with the proposed text and introduced Matt Starr, who was recently hired by Crawford Hoying to help with this project.

Mr. Langworthy reiterated that this is the introduction phase that provides an opportunity to ask questions.

Jeff Tyler asked what the downside might be to the proposed Zoning Code amendment and area rezoning.

Ms. Ray said the change in text is pretty straightforward; they plan to clarify the drive-through uses as it is currently prohibited except for banks.

Mr. Yoder said he was fine with the conditional use. He said they hope to add a coffee shop-type of restaurant with a drive-through that would not be visible from the shopping corridor. He said the drive-through would have alley access and not be accessible or have frontage from the main roadway.

Ms. Ray said with the City as the applicant, an eating/drinking drive-through use would need to be added to the Code.

Ms. Ray said she had discussed the types of building materials with Crawford Hoying as part of the potential Zoning Code amendment. She said at this point, only minimal modifications were recommended to the Building Types. She said any Code modifications to other parts of the Code other than the neighborhood district will apply across the board.

Mr. Langworthy asked if the riverside park was included in the rezoning or if it was going to be placed in the Public District. Fred Hahn inquired about the standards and permitted uses.

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any further questions or comments.

Colleen Gilger said she would approve of a drive-through for an eating/drinking use.

Mr. Langworthy explained these cannot sprout up anywhere as they need to keep the pedestrian-oriented character of this neighborhood and Ms. Ray reiterated that the drive-throughs will need to be placed on the back side of the buildings, where any are located.

Mr. Hahn inquired about block size, parks, and connectivity. Mr. Langworthy said parks could be in the Public zoning district.

Ms. Ray asked if there were any further comments. [There were none.] Mr. Langworthy reiterated that Ms. Ray's report will highlight all the differences being proposed.

**6. Area Rezoning – Bridge Street District – Riverside Neighborhood District
14-040Z Zoning Map Amendment**

Rachel Ray said this is a request for an area rezoning of 19 parcels for the Riverside Neighborhood District in the Bridge Street District. She said this is a request for review and recommendation regarding proposed land use map amendments under the provisions of Zoning Code Sections 153.232 and 153.234.

Ms. Ray said the conversation for the Zoning Amendment application above would apply here as well. She presented a map showing the proposed change in zoning districts.

Ms. Ray asked if there were any further comments. [There were none.]

ADMINISTRATIVE

Mr. Langworthy asked if there were any administrative issues or other items for discussion. [There were none.] The meeting was adjourned at 3:19 pm.